

## Instructions for Submitting Interim and Final Reports

The Cover Sheet must include the signature of an official authorized to submit grant certifications on the part of the reporting institution. In most cases this will be the Authorized Organizational Representative (AOR). All components of each report package must be submitted together. *Your report may be submitted in any one of three ways:*

- Reports of 20 pages or less, including Cover Sheet and attachments, *may be sent electronically* to [imlsreporting@imls.gov](mailto:imlsreporting@imls.gov). If the Report is submitted electronically, the Cover Sheet as signed by the authorized official must be scanned, formatted as a PDF file, and sent in the same electronic mailing as the body of the report. If this method is used, the grantee is required to maintain the document with the original signature for three years, in case it is required to resolve a question. If report attachments include text or images, and high-quality versions can be transmitted electronically, include them in a single electronic mailing with the Cover Sheet and Performance Report. **Web-based material must be provided on disk or in hard copy, so reports that include this component must be mailed to Grants Administration, as below.**
- Reports of 20 pages or less, including Cover Sheet and attachments, *may be faxed* to 202-653-4604. If this method is used, the grantee is required to maintain the document with the original signature for three years, in case it is required to resolve a question. If report attachments include text or images, and high-quality versions can be transmitted by fax, include them in a single transmission with the Cover Sheet and Performance Report. **Web-based material must be provided on disk or in hard copy, so reports that include this component must be sent to Grants Administration as below.**
- **Reports of more than 20 pages, including Cover Sheet and attachments, and reports of any length that include Web-based material among attachments** should be sent with the original signed Cover Sheet to:

Grants Administration  
Institute of Museum and Library Services  
1800 M Street, NW / 9<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington, DC 20036-5802

**Project Title:** Connecting to Collections: Guam Baseline Study

**Partners:** Guam Community College, Richard Flores Taitano Micronesian Area Research Center (MARC—Univ. of Guam), Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Library (Univ. of Guam), and Guam Public Library System

### **Project Overview**

This grant project was to conduct a baseline study of the island's libraries and museums and their ability to care for their collections. Sixty-one collecting institutions libraries, museums, non-profit organizations, and local governmental agencies that have cultural materials participated. The methodology was a mixed methods approach involving a partial reduplication of the national *Heritage Health Index* survey and a quantitative/qualitative portion that incorporated participant comments into the analysis. Survey data were analyzed twice: first as a single data set of 61 institutions to give the island-wide baseline and then as six data sets of similar institution types. The end product of the survey was a 136-page document that provided statistical data that collecting institutions can use for planning and professional development purposes and provides public policy members and institutional stakeholders with an idea of the current state of the island's collecting institutions and their collections.

### **Project Activities**

The project's milestones and tasks can be clustered into the following activities:

- a) compiling information about the agencies and institutions who have collections that have historical and cultural value
- b) surveying collecting institutions regarding the types of materials they collect, the current physical status of their collections, and their ability to care for their collections
- c) analyzing the data in order to come up with recommended next steps.

### **Project Audiences**

There was a primary project audience, specifically local libraries, museums, non-profit organizations, and local governmental agencies that have been tasked with caring for cultural materials. The committee initially identified fifty-one institutions. That number increased to sixty-six possible institutions and sixty-one institutions (representing a minimum of seventy-three collection personnel) participated the study. The study was undertaken and written with two additional audiences also in mind, namely public and institutional stakeholders as well as patrons and clients of the collecting institutions. Thus, the team ensured that the report was written to be understandable and useful to both collection personnel and external stakeholders.



## **Project Analysis**

### **Achievements and their Value**

Despite challenges, there was 100% completion of all but one milestone (the milestone on acquiring software was deemed unnecessary based on the size of the population sample and funds were diverted to printing costs). A full accounting of milestones and their completion are attached to this report. Thus, in this section I will discuss the groupings of milestones and their importance. The first two milestones focused on compiling contact information for the island's collecting institutions. These milestones were important to the project because they comprised the participant pool for the survey. They also served as a networking exercise in which the libraries on the project team got to interact with other library personnel (outside of who they work with on a daily basis) on a single project, which highlighted the range of policies and operating procedures that exist with regard to collections. Finally, these milestones proved important to the project team because it allowed team members to identify unusual pockets of resources and share that information with colleagues, thereby strengthening the ability of the team's libraries to serve their respective patrons.

The most significant set of milestones were related to the survey itself. The process was not without its challenges but we were able to successfully complete the survey. The value of this project became apparent almost immediately after we began the survey. It is interesting to note that, as the surveys were being conducted, participating institutions realized the how they could use this data and requested copies of their individual survey sheets so that that data could be shared with their immediate supervisors for assessment and planning purposes as well as placed into the institution's historical files. Thus, even before the data analysis had begun, certain institutions were already taking the data into consideration at the institutional level.

The study findings indicated that there were over 14.5 million items held in the island's collecting institutions. The four largest collection types were: unbound sheets (9.6 million) digital (2,704,290), photographic (1,070,144) and bound volumes (1,042,199). Of these 14.5 million items, approximately 12,559,783 were identified as historically and/or culturally significant regional materials with unbound (9,666,377) and digital resources (2,656,660) being the largest collections and archaeological collections potentially having the smallest number (3 collections + unknown quantities). In term of preserving regional materials, the institutions reported having little preservation need for books (93% no need), recorded sound (94% no need), and digital (100% no need). In contrast, the institutions reported having some preservation need for archaeological collections (100%), unbound sheets (56%), and natural science specimens (30%).

This interest and the sizes of collections influenced the way the analysis was done. It was initially thought that a single analysis would be done to provide a snapshot of the island's ability to care for its cultural resources. However, when it was apparent that the needs and realities of smaller collections were minimized by those of the larger collections, it became important to see how each type of institution fared. Thus, an institutional type analysis was done to provide the data that was more relevant and

useful to their planning purposes. Recommendations for each institutional type varied slightly:

Museums:

- I. Conduct a comprehensive inventory and condition assessment.
- II. Create a written collection care manual for staff.
- III. Invest in personnel to ensure a proactive approach to collection care.

Archives:

- I. Develop a long-range plan for preservation and conservation activities

Academic Libraries:

- I. Update disaster/emergency management plans
- II. Conduct professional development with staff to make them aware of

Public Libraries:

- I. Conduct a comprehensive inventory and condition assessment of collection

Special Libraries & Collections:

1. Conduct a comprehensive inventory and condition assessment of collection

Youth oriented institutions:

- i. review existing policies and incorporate conservation/preservation activities as a way to demonstrate fiduciary responsibility but not impeded the evolving nature of the collection;
- ii. focus preservation professional development efforts to print and non-print materials, primarily photographs, maps/oversized items, and recorded sound.

The study made evident one very basic recommendation that needs to be carried out by each collecting institution: each collecting agency must define and know its collection (content, size, format/item type, and condition) in order to develop a plan for maintenance and preservation. All efforts to improve collections care need to be based upon this knowledge.

In addition to providing practical data to be used in planning, the entire survey provided opportunities for theoretical discussions and reflections. For instance, the presentation of findings to the local library association initiated fruitful discussions over the individual librarian's role in serving as a professional in determining what should be preserved as well as being a role model and advocate for preservation of cultural resources.

### Obstacles

We needed to overcome two obstacles over the course of the grant, namely the personnel problems and the small number of project team members, and computational errors of data. We were aware of the local challenges of hiring personnel prior to the project's start and had written the grant with this in mind so we did not expect problems in the hiring process. However, the project design was not sufficient to hedge that problem. An additional inconvenience was added responsibilities on the part of committee members. Because each institution has a small staff size, staffing irregularities at their respective library did take the members' attention momentarily



away from their tasks. It is mentioned as an inconvenience because it did not directly affect the timeline but did add stress to meeting the milestone timelines. Fortunately, the individual we hired was a quick learner and highly efficient so she was able to step in and help us overcome these challenges.

Another significant obstacle was late detection of errors in data computation. One line of data was inadvertently left out of the initial analysis matrix. This error was not detected until we were well into our writing process. While the margin of error was small, we needed to review our analysis make the necessary corrections. The lesson learned from the computational errors was that we needed to make sure we double-check our data matrices before and after any analysis is done.

### **What's Next**

On a large-scale level, discussions had happened between participants on how to engage in professional development projects related to collections care. On a positive note, the collections housed at the University of Guam have already discussed ways in which this data can be used to further its collection care processes. Various upgrade projects to its physical facilities and this study's findings now provide MARC with the ability to pursue grant opportunities to conduct a comprehensive preservation assessment of its collections. On a negative note, organizational changes (new administrators, reorganizations, etc) have occurred that may impact the support other public collecting institutions receive. Thus, the ability of other collections to continue these efforts will depend upon their ability to convince their parent organizations of the importance of conserving and preserving cultural resources, especially when these resources are not seen as "historical" or when the desire is the keep pace with technology.

FINAL REPORT Submitted: 9/1/2011

1. Convene members in April 2009: **100% COMPLETED (as per 1<sup>st</sup> Qtr Report: 10/27/2009)**

2. Develop database of institutions during months May & June 2009: **100% COMPLETED (as per 1<sup>st</sup> Qtr Report: 10/27/2009)**

3. Purchase software in months May & June 2009: **FUNDS REALLOCATED TO COVER PRINTING COSTS**

The small survey size negated the need for the purchase of statistical software. The funds were reallocated to cover the costs of printing the report.

4. Develop survey instrument during months May through July 2009: **100% COMPLETE (as per Q2 Report)**

In October and November 2009, the two pilot sites were visited and the survey administered (one conducted by principal investigator and the other by the research assistant).

5. Pilot test survey & develop protocols for conducting survey between July and September 2009: **100% COMPLETED (as per Q2 Report)**

Surveys were conducted with pilot sites during October and November 2009. As a result, minor adjustments and additions were made to the survey instruments based on the comments and questions from the pilot sites and the researchers themselves. Added to the instrument was an accounting for the amount of time it took to complete the survey and a question related to whether or not the libraries had the resources they needed to carry out needed repairs or maintenance.

6. Conduct Survey from October 2009 through February 2010: **100% COMPLETED (as per Q2 Report)**

Data collection began in November 2009 and ended by February 18, 2010. Fifty-nine (59) out of a possible 66 institutions completed the survey. The total number of institutions varied from what was reported in the first quarterly report because we realized that we had not included an island zoo in our original listing. In terms of percentages, we were able to garner a 90% completion rate from our original listing or an 89% completion rate when factoring the zoo into the number of possible institutions. Seven institutions did not participate, with 6 indicating they did not wish to participate and 1 unable to participate due to prolonged illness.

In total, the survey captured data on two museums, three archives, five special libraries, six public libraries, 39 that claimed an academic focus (two post-secondary and 37 school libraries), and four that claimed "other" as their primary purpose. While the national version of the survey viewed public library systems as an entity, we chose to investigate each library branch as an individual because previous austerity measures had caused the closure of various branches and we were interested to see how these closures were impacting the library.



FINAL REPORT Submitted: 9/1/2011

**7. Hire & train research assistant August 2009 and September 2009: 100% COMPLETED (as per Q2 Report)**

One research assistant was employed between November 2009 and March 2010. Her duties involved assisting with data collection, survey development and preparing the data for analysis.

**8. Analyze data from November 2009 to March 2010: 100% COMPLETED (as per Q3 Report)**

Data analysis was completed in June 2010. A minor computational error was discovered in early June, which skewed the data slightly and set the data analysis phase back. Thus, the data was computed again and data was reanalyzed.

Two levels of analysis were completed on the data. One method of analysis had one data set that looked at the island as a whole, which provided for direct comparisons to the Heritage Health Index so it was easier to place Guam's situation within the national arena. The second analysis broke the full set of data into similar institutional types, this type provides another type of data that is beneficial for planning purposes for each type of library, archive or museum.

**9. Write report from January to May 2010: 100% COMPLETED**

While some writing was done in March, the bulk of the report writing occurred between April and July 2010. As a result of the computational error, the completion of the report was delayed until August 2010. Comments and suggestions on the draft document were received up between September and November 2010. The penultimate draft was then sent to Pacific Resources in Education and Learning (PREL) who served as an external reviewer. They were selected because of their familiarity with and for their recent library-related training activities in the region. The final draft was completed in April 2011 based on the comments and questions received from PREL.

**10. Take draft to participating collecting institutions for review, questions, comments in months 11 & 12: 100% COMPLETED (as per Q3 Report)**

The delays in analysis and writing phases set back the review, dissemination phase until the various participating institutions and local library associations reconvened in Fall. Copies of the draft report were distributed in the August meeting of the local library association. A public presentation was made and the report's findings were discussed during the September meeting and comments are being solicited from the interested parties.

**11. Publish and disseminate report in month 15: 100% Complete.**

Due to the size of the document, the final report was printed through a local photocopy store. Quotes were sought out according to local procurement guidelines. The document was printed using perfect bind, black and white. Distribution of the report to participating institutions began in July 2011.



## **Final Performance Report: Part 2, Quantitative Information**

The purpose of the final performance report is to provide a permanent record of program accomplishments. The Institute will use the numbers from this quantitative form to report to Congress and the Office of Management and Budget about the agency's progress on addressing its strategic goals of sustaining cultural heritage and knowledge, enhancing learning and innovation, and supporting the professional development of library and museum staff.

Refer to Glossary to Support Grant Reporting (<http://www.imls.gov/pdf/Glossary.pdf>) to assist with definitions of terms.

IMLS has identified a number of activities, products, and participant groups that are commonly addressed through IMLS grants and seeks output/outcome data about these on this form. In your interim and final narrative reports, you are asked to describe project activities – this form seeks to gather the quantitative data associated with these activities. While your grant may have multiple activities (and all should be listed in the narrative part of your report), you should identify up to three main activities (that have discrete outputs or outcomes) per grant and complete one of the following forms for each activity. For instance, your grant may have mounted an exhibit, conducted teacher workshops, and developed a related curriculum. You should fill out one form per activity, since each will have a different set of outputs or outcomes, and may have served distinct audiences. If your grant consisted of one primary activity, such as supporting 12 students to complete Master's degrees, one form will probably be sufficient. If you have questions about which activities to choose to record on this form, refer them to your program officer.

The form has been developed to cover the most common of grant activities. Since every grant is unique to its own institution and audience, some grants have outputs and outcomes from activities not included on this form. Questions 10, 15 and 24 are catch-alls. The responses to these questions should not be included in other responses.

How to fill out this form: Numbers should encompass only those activities and individuals directly affected by or involved in your project between your grant start and end dates. Leave blank any items that do not apply to your grant or for which you do not have actual figures or reasonable estimates.



**Institution Name:** University of Guam

**Grant #:** LG - 41 - 09 - 0019 - 09

**A. SITE SPECIFIC PROJECT ACTIVITY:** Connecting to Collections: Guam Baseline Study

1. 0 Total # of collection items conserved, relocated to protective storage, rehoused, or for which other preservation-appropriate physical action was taken.

2. 0 Total # of collection items digitized, scanned, reformatted, or for which other electronic or digital preservation action was taken.

3. 0 Total # of collection items with new or enhanced accessibility (include items that were cataloged or for which finding aids or other records were created or computerized) [includes \_\_\_\_\_ items made accessible to users other than grantee staff for the first time, \_\_\_\_\_ items with new or enhanced access for staff only].

4. 2 Total # of lectures, symposia, demonstrations, exhibits, readings, performances, concerts, broadcasts, Webcasts, workshops, multi-media packages, or other learning opportunities provided for the public (do not include PSAs or other promotional activities) [includes \_\_\_\_\_ out-of-school or after-school programs, \_\_\_\_\_ exhibits].

5. 0 Total # of tools created, improved, or produced for searching, information management, or information analysis by users other than or in addition to grantee staff.

6. 0 Total # of conferences, programs, workshops, training sessions, institutes, classes, courses, or other structured educational events provided.

7. 0 Total # of internships, apprenticeships, mentoring opportunities, or other extended educational opportunities provided.

8. 0 Total # of degrees/certificates earned as a result of the grant [includes \_\_\_\_\_ Master's, \_\_\_\_\_ Ph.D. degrees, \_\_\_\_\_ other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_].

9. 0 Total # technology upgrades or improvements (specify): \_\_\_\_\_.

10. If your grant engaged in other activities not covered by the categories above, please briefly identify and quantify them here. Attach another sheet if necessary.

61 Total # of information providing institutions surveyed about current abilities to collect, preserve, and provide access to cultural materials.

14,514,224 Total # of resources held in Guam's collecting institutions [includes 9673213 feet and 4400 items of unbound sheets, 1,070,144 photographic, 16,831 moving images, 5958 recorded sound items, 2,704,290 digital, 203 art objects, 903 historical/ethnographical objects,

1,042,199 bound volumes. 3 + undetermined quantity of archaeological collections], 480 science specimens

12,559,783 Total # of historically and/or culturally significant resources cared for by the island's collecting institutions [including 87284 bound resources, 9,666,377 unbound, 144,822 photographic, 3538 moving images, 1005 recorded sound, 2,656,660 digital, 154 art objects, 3 + undetermined amount of archaeological collections, 637 historic/ethnographic, 230 science specimens

## **B. PORTABLE PRODUCTS (relating to the activity named in section A.)**

11. 1 Total # of research reports, papers, books, reprints, or other publications generated.

12. 0 Total # of Web sites developed or improved [include URLs/addresses:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_].

13. 0 Total # of learning resources produced [includes \_\_\_\_\_ oral histories, \_\_\_\_\_ curriculum resources, \_\_\_\_\_ curriculums, \_\_\_\_\_ Web-based learning tools, or \_\_\_\_\_ other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_].

14 1 Total # of key management documents created [includes \_\_\_\_\_ emergency plans, \_\_\_\_\_ conservation surveys, \_\_\_\_\_ strategic plans, 1 other (specify): Final product was a baseline study to use in development of strategic plans for libraries and in review of emergency plans by various collecting institutions. It provides data that helps explain the current status of collecting institutions to local officials.

15. If your grant created one or more quantifiable products not covered by the categories above, please briefly identify and quantify them here. Attach another sheet if necessary.

## **C. PARTICIPANTS/VISITORS/USERS/AUDIENCE (relating to the activity named in section A.)**

16. 61 Total # of **community organization partners** [includes 59 informal partners, 3 formal partners].



17. 42 Total # of **schools** (pre-K through grade 12) that used services provided by your grant (include only schools that actively participated, not those to which material was simply distributed or made available) [includes \_\_\_\_\_ students participating in field trips].

18. 0 Total # of **teachers** supported, trained, or otherwise provided with resources to strengthen classroom teaching or learning.

19. 0 Total # of **pre-K through grade-12 students** served [includes \_\_\_\_\_ youth 9-19 who used, participated, visited, or otherwise interacted with activities, experiences, resources, or products offered by your grant].

20. 0 Total # of **viewers and listeners** for radio, television, and cable broadcasts (for series, include total actual audience for all broadcasts; do not include audience for PSAs or other promotional activities or Webcasts; do not report potential audience).

21. 0 Total # of **users of Web-based resources** provided by your grant (include all individuals the project served). Choose the measure that best represents your use rate (choose only one): \_\_\_\_\_ visits (hits), \_\_\_\_\_ unique visitors, \_\_\_\_\_ registered users, \_\_\_\_\_ other measure (specify): \_\_\_\_\_.

22. 73 Total # of **individuals** benefiting from your grant (include all those from questions 18-21 plus others the project served, including staff or others in your field). Only include those who actually participated or used your project services in some way.

23. This number includes: \_\_\_\_\_ **professionals**, \_\_\_\_\_ **non-professionals or pre-professionals**, \_\_\_\_\_ **docents or interpreters**, \_\_\_\_\_ **volunteers**, \_\_\_\_\_ **staff** that received services provided by your grant.

24. If your grant served one or more quantifiable audiences not covered by the categories above, please briefly identify and quantify them here. Attach another sheet if necessary.

Directions for submitting this report are available at <http://www.ims.gov/recipients/administration.shtm>. For assistance or questions contact your Program Officer.

Burden Estimate and Request for Public Comments: Public reporting burden for this collection of information (Final Report, Parts 1 and 2) is estimated to average eight to thirteen hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comment regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Institute of Museum and Library Services, Chief Information Officer, 1800 M Street, NW, 9th Floor,

Washington, DC 20036-5802, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project 3137-0029, Washington, DC 20503.